

(b) U.S. patent 5,105,952 (Krattiger) in view of
U.S. Patent 6,193,336.

On pages 10 and 11 of Applicant's August 4, 2004,
Response lists every one of the Examiner's rejections
including those indicated in (a) and (b) above.

Applicant continues on page 11 of its response by
indicating that:

Applicant respectfully traverses all of
these rejections especially as applied to
claims 23 and 53 as amended.

Applicant thereafter distinguishes the Jencka patent from the
claimed invention on the basis that Jencka is either the
primary or secondary prior art citation in each of the
rejections listed on pages 10 and 11.

Accordingly, Applicant thereafter maintained on page
15 of its response:

... that the invention is new and unobvious
and not disclosed by the cited art.


This was done with the understanding that none of the
combinations cited by the Examiner anticipated the claimed
invention as Applicant submitted that all the Jencka features
utilized by the Examiner to support each combination were not
taught by Jencka.

Appln. No. 09/830,698
Reply dated January 13, 2005
Reply to Office Communication of 12/13/2004

If this was not clear to the Examiner from its August 4, 2004, response, applicant reiterates that the combinations cited by the Examiner in her May 4, 2004, rejection, do not anticipate the claimed invention as the features of Jencka cited by the examiner to support to support these combinations are not taught by Jencka for the reasons set out in Applicant's August 4, 2004, response.

Applicant respectfully requests that continued examination of the application be undertaken as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:jec
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\Actj\Fenger1\Pto\RESPONSE 13 JAN 05.doc